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Introduction

In one form or another, the contents of this paper will be incorporated in a reference grammar of Colville-Okanagan now in preparation. The flow of ongoing discussions with other members of the Salish scholarly community, most notably N. Mattina, S. Thomason, B. Carlson, and S. Egesdal, has determined the contents and organization of this paper. I do not recapitulate the outline of my view of the Colville-Okanagan transitive system, but I refer readers to the works listed as references. 1

11. -nt vs. -fl. -nt and -fl stems contrast as follows. The -nt stem contains (besides the ergative subject) a direct object:
I note now that while there is a sense in which the morphosyntax of -ft stems shows three participants, the requirement that possessor and possessed must be co-referential, in effect maintains the bivalence of the stem with an ergative subject and a direct object. I will return to this point presently.

Hundreds, if not thousands, of examples confirm the productivity of -nt and -ft:

3a. sfws-ant-x* i? lkapf.
You drank the coffee.

c. "ac'antx*.
You looked at it.

e. náq"+m-ant-x* i? sqlaw.3
You stole the money.

g. wixxan-(n)-x* i? yq'ip.
You lengthened the belt.

i. k'u siw-nt-x*.
You asked me.

k. k'ín-(n)-an i? atmupf.
I tried the car.

m. q'ýy'-nt-fn i-sk'fst.
I wrote my name.

o. "acá-nt.
Tie it!

q. sop'-á-nt.
Hit it!

s. c'ók'-c'k'd-nt.
Discipline him!

u. txt'a-nt.
Take care of it!

w. ník'-ánt.
Cut it!

b. k'u sfw-tt-x* in-lkapf.
You drank my coffee.

d. k'u "ac'-tt i-sc-k'"íl*.
Look at my work!

f. k'u náq"+m-nt-tt-x in-kawdp.
You stole my horse.

h. k'u wixxan-tt-tt-x* in-yq'ip.
You lengthened my belt.

j. k'u siw-tt-s i-sq"stf.
You lengthened my belt.

l. k'u k'ín-nt-tt i-atmupf.
He tried out my car.

n. k'u q'ýy'-tt-tk* i-sk'fst.
Write my name!

p. k'u "ac-tt-tk* in-q'a'xán.
Tie my shoe!

r. k'u sap'-tt-tk* in-pumín.
Hit my drum!

t. k'u c'ók'-c'ók'-tt-tk* i-sq"sq"sf.
Discipline my child!

v. k'u txat'-tt-tk* in-cfx*.
Take care of my house!

x. k'u ník'-átt isx'á'cinam i? sfí?i-s.
Cut my deer hide!

3 The symbol + marks a morpheme boundary that is irrelevant to the current discussion or exemplification.

Fitting the pattern first outlined, a stem like ?am-t 'feed' has

4a. k'u ?am-tsf.

k'u ?am -t -ts i- sq"sf?

b. k'u ?am-ttt sfí?

k'u ?am -tt-ts i- sq"sf?

Note that the only possible interpretation of (the grammatical)

5. k'u ?am-átt i? sfí?

k'u ?am-ttt -s i? sfí?.

k'u ?am -tt-ts i- sq"sf?

is that of the gloss, 'he fed my son to me.' Note also that -tt not only excludes the readings of coreferential object marker and possessive affix, it also allows for any possessed form:

6a. k'u ?am-átt i? sfí?

k'u ?am -tt-ts i- sq"sf?

k'u ?am-átt i? sfí?

Take care of my house!

x. k'u ník'-átt isx'á'cinam i? sfí?i-s.
Cut my deer hide!

Three pairs of -tt and -tt stems will further exemplify the contrast:
8. k'u siwts isq'sf? i? sk'fst.
   k'u siw -tt -s i- sq'sf? i? sk'fst -s
   me ask -tt he my son art name -his
   He asked my son what his name is. DD

9. k'u suht'is isq'sf? i? sk'fst.
   k'u su -tt't -s i- sq'sf? i? sk'fst -s
   me ask -tt't he my son art name -his
   He asked me what my son's name is. DD

10. a. k'u sq'at'ts islip'.
    b. k'u saq'tutts i? slip'.
   k'u sq' -tt -s i- slip'
   me split -tt he my wood
   He split my wood.

11. a. k'u q'sloq'its isq'sf? i? k'ol scanq'a?llsc.
    b. k'u q'sloq' 'll -tt -s i- sq'sf? i? k'ol scanq'a?llsc -c
   me talk -tt't he my son art about business -his
   He talked to my son about his business. DD

12. a. k'u q'sloq'at'tuts i? scanq'a'flsc.
    b. k'u q'sloq' -tt't -s i? scanq'a?llsc -c
   me talk -tt't he art business -his
   He talked to me about his business. DD

In the last two examples one can see the treatment of scanq'a?llsc, once as an adjunct with the preposition k'ol, and once as the direct object argument, without preposition.

1.3. Problems with the interpretation of -ts stems.
1.3.1. Ambiguous -ts stems. Some verb stems pose some problem of analysis, for example stems like cu-nt 'say to' and m'ay'-nt 'tell about'. These have direct objects too, no matter what the underlying thematic roles of the arguments of the verbs might be. These two forms may best be glossed as indicated in parentheses:

13. a. cunt'san
    cu -nt -s -an
    say -nt obj subj
    I said to you. (I informed you.)

    b. k'u m'ay'ntfs
    k'u m'ay' -nt -fs
    obj tell -nt subj
    He told about me. (He discussed me.)

But whatever the details of the semantics mapped by these -nt stems, the correspondent -tt stems differ from the -nt stems as other such stems do: what was the direct object in the -nt stem is now a possessor, while reference is added to a possessed object, with concomitant relegation of the object person marker to the role of possessor:

14. a. k'u cut'ts isq'sf?.
    b. k'u m'ay'tt's isq'sf?.
   k'u cu -tt -s i- sq'sf?.
   possr tell -tt subj my son
   He told my son RA, AA
   He told my son about it. DD

Complications are introduced by the following facts: An utterance like k'u cut'ts isq'sf? can be also taken to mean as 'My son told me', though the best account of this interpretation is that the utterance is heard as a fancying up of

15. k'u cun isq'sf?.
   k'u cu -nt -s i- sq'sf?.
   obj tell -nt subj my son
   My son told me.

The utterance ixf' k'...m'ay'ntfs isrq'sf'. taken to mean 'My son told me about it.' can also be seen as a hypercorrection of

16. k'u m'ay'ntfs isq'sf?.
    k'u m'ay' -nt -fs i- sq'sf?.
    obj tell -nt subj my son
    My son told me.

Similarly cuit'san asq'sf?. 'I told your son.' DD, analyzed

---

4In the transcription of texts we (the members of the Okanagan Language Group of the En'owkin Centre) use the ligature to link clitics with their mother words. I dispense with the symbol in the numbered examples of this paper.

5In motivation not unlike that of such English patterns as 'they invited Carl, Jane, and myself;' 'they invited Jane and I.' 'Myself' and 'I' sound more formal than 'me.'
17. cufts asq'səf?
   cu -ft-s -an a- sq'səf?
tell -ft obj subj your son
I told your son.

is (correctly) translated ‘I told it to your son,’ while by itself, cu-ffs-an, without an expressed argument, is interpreted as ‘I told it to you’ (a hypercorrection of citsan). k'u-ctafts is interpreted as ‘He told it to me,’ a hypercorrection of k'u-cus:

18. k'u cus.
   k'u cu -nt -s
   obj tell -nt subj
   He told it to me.

1.3.2. Bases without -nt stems. The interpretation of the object referents of -nt forms as indirect objects (and not possessors) is encouraged by a couple of bases that have -ft and -xt stems, but no -nt stems. These are x'ic'-give,' and k'f + x'ic' 'send.' Thus we have x'ic'-ft, x'ic'-xt, but *x'ic'-nt. With these transitive stems the object referents are regularly interpreted as the recipients (and the difference between the -ft and -xt stem is also the expected one, as explained in section 1.4.):

19. a. ha? k'u akx'ic'-xtam? McG
   Are you going to give it to me?
   (something definite, e.g.
   the one in your hand)
   b. ha? k'u akx'ic'-xtam? McG
   Are you going to give things to me?
   (something indefinite)
   c. k'u x'ic'-xts i? sl'xts i? sqlaw's.
   He gave me his friend's money.
   d. k'u x'ic'-xts t sqlaw'.
   He gave me some money.

In other words, x'ic'-ft and x'ic'-xt are best glossed ‘give something to someone,’ while the stem x'ic' + x + m -nt is best glossed ‘give something away.’ In the former stems the object referent is the recipient, and in the latter stem the object referent is the goal.

6A base consists of a root (two in compounds) with or without some other morphological material immaterial to the stem. Otherwise stated, a base is a stem minus the derivational affix in question. See N. Mattina 1994 for discussion.

7There may be a few more bases with the same limitation.

8For examples of forms of this stem and related discussion see examples 23-25.

1.3.3. Stems without indirect objects. With stems that do not tolerate indirect objects, -nt forms are interpreted as having a second object, possessed by the object, but not legitimately (the difference seems to be, as in the examples I give here, that between my gun and the gun I have):

20. t'i? can'htx' pit, ur uk'itts i? tatw'it i? st'atq'ána'ks.
As soon as Pete came in, he saw the gun that the boy had (not necessarily the boy's gun)
21. ta n'ux'tx' pit, ur way' cm'istis i? tatw'it, uk'itts i? st'atq'ána'ks.
When Pete came in, the boy knew that Pete had seen the gun he (the boy) had
22. kan ta? n'ux'tx', cm'istis i? tatw'it way' uktittan i? st'atq'ána'ks.
When I went in, the boy knew that I had seen the gun he had.

1.4. -ft vs. -xt/lt. Whereas -ft stems make reference to a possessed, hence definite direct object, -xt/lt forms make reference to indefinite direct objects. Default indefinite direct objects are either (1) plain indefinite forms—simple nouns without possessive or unrealized affixes, or (2) possessed unrealized ones—nouns marked with the future prefix k't- and a possessive affix. Here are some sets of examples to demonstrate the contrast:

23. ca'k' k'u ca'k'ic'-txm' ismán'x'?
   ca'k' k'u ca'k'ic'-txm' i? t ktlkapf.
   Should me cislt- give -tx you my-smoke
   Please give me my smokes.
24. k'u ca'k'ic'-tx i? t ktlkapf.
   k'u ca'k'ic'-tx i? t ktlkapf
   me cislt- give -tx art t bread
   Give me some bread.
25. n'ln'w'lt's x'ic'txman t aktlkapf. RA
   n'ln'w'lt's x'ic' -xt -m n t a- ktlkapf
   if_and_when give -xt you I t your fut coffee
   I'll eventually give you some coffee. (I plan to ...)
26. way' ka'k'citsan aq'a'xtán.
   way' ka'k'citsan aq'a'xtán
   yes find -t you I t your shoes
   I found your shoes.
27. ka'k'citsan t aktq'a'xtán.
   ka'k'citsan t aktq'a'xtán
   find -xt you I t your fut shoes
   I found you some shoes.
28. lut k'ū akxsnāq'"mt tam inkawáp.
lut k'ū a- ks- nāq" + m -t -om in- kawáp
not me your fut steal -ft -m' my horse
Don't steal my horse from me.

29. lut k'ū akxsnāq'"xtam t ikkf kawáp.
lut k'ū a- ks- nāq" -xt -am t i- kt- kawáp
not me your fut steal -ft -m t my fur horse
Don't steal a horse for me.

2. Notes preliminary to the discussion of stems extended with -min.
Before I discuss stems extended with -min. I survey briefly the function of word-final -m (as opposed to stem-forming -m), that summarizes how I classify these affixes. Implicit in this presentation is the fact that I do not try to conflate these morphs into smaller sets of morphemes.

2.1. -m 3rd person switched (passive) subject. This morpheme, cognate with -m 'passive' / 'indefinite subject' of related languages marks a switched passive subject, that is, a third person singular subject that is co-referential with (the same as) the subject (usually active) of the preceding clause. If expressed, the agent phrase requires ='../. Contrast the following:

30. can'útx" pit, ut wiks i? sq'xs's.
can'útx" pit, ut wik-Θ-s i? sq'st'-s
come_in Peteį and saw-him-he, art son- hisj Pete came in, and saw his son.

31. can'útx" pit, ut wkntam i? t sq'st'-.s
can'útx" pit, ut wknt-am i? t sq'st'-s
come_in Peteį and saw-he, art t son- hisj Pete came in, and his son saw him.

Note the reading of a sentence with wik-fr:

32. can'útx" pit, ut wiktts i? sq'st'-.s.
can'útx" pit, ut wiktt-Θ-s i? sq'st'-s
come_in Peteį and saw-him-he, art son- hisj Pete came in, and he saw his son.

and note -m '3rd person switched passive subject' with -fr:

33. can'útx" pit, ut wikf tam i? t taw'tt i? st'at'q'ðna?ks.
Pete came in and the boy saw [Pete]'s pistol.

34. can'útx" pit, ut wiktt i? t taw'tt i? st'at'q'ðna?ks.
Pete came in and saw the boy's pistol.

Note the use of cu-s / cá-n-om in an exchange which includes examples of two intransitive forms (cut and scutx) which serve to break the pattern active subject + goal / switched passive subject + actor:

35. cus iʔ_lkrlmfix's: *x'uyx, k'ant i?_̣ ʃ̣ ỵ a?.
He said to his wife: "Go get the saskatoons.
cụ́ntám "c'sap iʔ_̣ ʃ̣ ỵ a? ."
She said to him "the saskatoons are all gone."

33. itʔ ōntam iʔ_̣ sq̣ ḷ mfx's: *k'aʔ ta sp'û'am mi k'c̣ k'â'm.
Then her husband said to her: "Then get some bitterroot."
cụsq̣ ḷ mfx's: *k'قś cinam ta 'unfx k'u sc̣ apst'mfx.
She said to her husband: "I told you, we really are out of grub."
cut iʔ_̣ sq̣ ḷ mfx's: *caʔk' lut k'laʔ_̣ cẓ ị ỵ ̣ m t_̣ sq̣ p̣ ị p̣ ẹ , qpnf caʔk' k'u x'â'st'k'â'l.
The man said: "If you hadn't been lazy last spring, now we'd have lots of grub."

36. (t) ōntam (iʔ_̣ lkṛ lmfix's): "k'aʔ way' nix' q'spîʔ ki? c'sap iʔ_̣ ʃ̣ q̣ t'at.
(His wife) said to him: "Heck, it's also been a while since our meat supply ended.
c'ant anwî nix' k'laʔ_̣ cẓ ị ỵ ̣ m, ut lut k'â'j'a k'ʃ̣ q̣ f.'
Look, you too were lazy, and we don't have any meat.

37. iʔ_̣ sq̣ ḷ mfx's: ixʔ scutx, mat âṭ̌ fîʔ k'u ik'aa-aslam k'u st'ilt'îmîlaʔx.
The man then said, "I guess we are both lazy."

I note finally that (1) isolated sentences like

36. wik-Θ-s pit saw-him-he Pete

can be interpreted with pit as either subject or object, but the natural reading has pit the object; and (2) that the elicitation of renderings of sentences like Mary saw him, and Mary saw Pete mimic the English syntax but should not be taken as prototypes of Okanagan sentences:

*SSee section 2.3.1. for a discussion of this -m.*
37. Mary saw-him-she
   a. mara wik-Theta
   Mary saw-him-she
   b. mara wik-Theta pit

2.2. *kN. -m 3rd subject - 1st pl object. Together these two affixes signal what I have glossed, *kN, 1st plural object; -m 3rd subject.

38. *k'u cuntam i? tatw'ft.
   k'u cu-n-t-am i? tatw'ft
   us tell-he art boy
   The boy told us.

The subject phrase is grammatical without -m, ungrammatical with it, and this sets apart -m 'passive' from this -m 'third subject with 1st pl object: '

\*k'u cu-n-t-am i? tatw'ft.

\*kN. cuntam i? tatw'ft: 'The boy told us.' parallels

39. k'u cus i? tatw'ft.
   k'u cu-s i? tatw'ft
   me tell-he art boy
   The boy told me.

with -m and -s marking the subject. Note that, as my gloss suggests, -m is singular and plural. *k'a cuntam-x i? tatw'ft is ungrammatical, whereas cuntam and cuntam-x contrast as exemplified:

40. a. cuntam i? tatw'ft.
    The boy told him.
   b. cuntam-x i? tatw'ft.
    The boy told them.

2.3. -m 'intransitivizer/middle'

2.3.1 -m intransitivizer. This is added to all transitive stems (which then become intransitive) in the genitive paradigm of person inflection, typified by such forms as

\*kN. -m -m of genitive paradigms with -m middle, discussed next.

2.3.2 -m middle. The -m I subsume here, cognates of which are sometimes labeled 'antipassive,' seems to perform two functions. The first is to intransitivize a base that, presumably, is felt to be inherently transitive. In order to be conjugated with the absolutive (intransitive) person referents, such a base must receive -m. Thus k"u/", felt to be inherently transitive (cf. k"u/ik-xu/" you fixed it), takes -m in the absolutive paradigm:

43. k"u/ik-xu/" you'll see me is also a complete sentence (parallel to *kN. an'iw 'I'm your father'), though in practice some supporting material usually accompanies it, as in

44. way' k'u akswik'am.
   You'll see me.

From a distributional point of view, I see nothing to prevent one from conflating the -m of genitive paradigms with -m middle, discussed next.

With basically intransitive bases, the situation is as follows. Such verb bases do not take -m, and, for example, x"uy, felt to be inherently intransitive, conjugates without -m in the absolutive (simple completive) paradigm:

45. kon k"u/ik-am
   I worked, I fixed/did something.

Noun bases take nothing in equational constructions

---

10 I explain this in my working paper on Okanagan aspect markers (A. Mattina 1993). One should keep in mind that -nt has allomorph -Theta in the singular or intransitivized forms.
47. kon sqaltmx·
   I am a man.

and (this is the second function of this morpheme) add -m to derive verb forms:

48. kon lasmíst-am
   I put my shirt on.

These verb forms, somewhat like the parallel English derivations, have a meaning related to that of the noun, but probably not predictable (see 'table a motion,' 'chair a committee,' 'handle a situation,' etc.).

2.3.3. Notes on the interpretation of -m stems. N. Mattina has made an interesting observation, that I present here, leaving to her the broad interpretation of these and related facts. In a sentences like kon.t*apdm Lš ś'axam 'I shot/killed a deer,' the verbal predicate is the middle stem t*apdm (in the lst sing. form) with an adjunct corresponding to the notional object. But a stem like txam 'comb one’s own hair' does not participate in a sentence where the notional object can be expressed with a t phrase. A t phrase forced on such a verbal predicate has either an instrumental reading

49. kon txam t ś'axam
   I combed my hair with a stick.

or calls for an interpretation of txam as ‘comb something:’

50. kon txam t qopqifte i t' alś sanktnútan. McG
   I combed some hair off the chair.

Forms such as kon.txam are parallel to forms with lexical suffixes, for example,

51. kon kc’aw?fw’sam.
   I washed my face.

52. a. kon c’aw?fw’katam.
    b. c’aw?fw’ksantx’.
    I washed my hands.     You washed his hands.
 c. kon txam
   d. txantín
   I combed my hair. I combed his hair.

T phrases with these verbal predicates are construed as instrumental, as

53. a. kon kc’aw?fw’sam t siwtk’.
    b. kon q’dcqnam t packt. McG, MT
    I washed my face with water. I used a leaf for a hat.

Occasionally speakers vacillate and disagree on whether or not -m is required in a given stem (usually with stems extended by other morphological material), and this does not seems an abnormal linguistic phenomenon. But while speakers are uncertain about adding -m to certain bases, as we have seen, there are two other sets of stems each defined by its behavior in the simple intransitive completive paradigm: (1) stems of one set lack a contrast between a form with -m and a bare one; and (2) stems of the other set show such a contrast. This suggests a diagnostic for class membership of verbs or nouns: nouns and transitive verbs derive middle verbs with -m; intransitive verbs do not have a middle form.

A corollary is that all complex transitive verb forms undergo -m suffixation when conjugated with the genitive referent set (see Aspect paper for details; see section 2.3.1. for comments on distribution).

54. kon x’uy (k’uy = intransitive verb base)
   I went
   *kon x’uy’

55. kon k’ul’am (t) ... (k’ul’ = transitive verb base)
   I worked/fixed ...
   *kon k’ul’ t ... (but kon k’ul’l’ (t) ... ‘I was born,’ ‘I turn to ...’)

13Cf. footnote 9.

14The simplest examples are of the kind lut aksantíptam (am) 'don’t forget (it),’ where the occurrences of the parenthesized elements correlate (see also examples 82-83). Cases like kon.š’tín(–am) Lš tíq’ ‘I ate some meat,’ also occur, and here the -m does not necessarily correlate with the expressed object. The vacillation between lut aksantíptam and lut aksantíptamnam shows -min+rr (transitive stem) plus intransitivizer -m.
56. kan naq"-am (t) ... (naq" = transitive verb base)
I stole ...
*kan naq"*

57. a. kan q"icqn. (q"dcqen = noun base)
I'm a hat.
b. kan q"icqnam.
I put a hat on.

3. -min.
3.1. Preliminaries. I keep -m 'middle' separate from the -m that, added to k"ul' (see example 55) derives a transitive stem k"ul'-m-nt 'use,' that contrasts with another transitive stem k"ul'-nt 'make, fix.' The -m of k"ul'-m-nt, which I analyze as the weak allomorph of -min, is a suffix that attaches to bases forming extended bases ready for transitivization with -nt, -st, -tuft.

As I now understand the workings of -min, this is a derivational affix that attaches to certain bases, not to others. All such derived -min bases are lexical entries. I do not have a definition of -min, notional or otherwise.

First, some comments about the stress properties of -m(f)n.

3.2. Weak bases. The majority of -min-nt stems that contrast with simple -nt transitive stems, show a weak base plus (stressed) -m plus -nt, forming a stem of the shape base-m(n)-nt. First I give the simplest examples, where a base = root:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak base + -nt:</th>
<th>Weak base + -m(n)-nt:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. c'q'ant</td>
<td>b. c'q'mint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hit something (with fist)</td>
<td>throw away (rock or similar object)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. sap'ánt</td>
<td>d. sap'mínt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hit something (with stick)</td>
<td>throw away (a stick)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. c'x'ant</td>
<td>f. c'x'mínt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pour (liquid)</td>
<td>spill (liquid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. pk&quot;ontín</td>
<td>h. pk&quot;mínt¹⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I poured it (solid) here</td>
<td>spill solids</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1ºTogether with c- this is the customary, not the causative. Cf. sections 3.5.1. and 3.9.

²As diagnostic I use bases comprised only of a root, otherwise the point is moot.

¹⁷These translations are the norm, but there is some uncertainty. Alongside examples 58g and h one finds pk"mínt 'I spread it around (as seeds)' 

3.3. Strong bases. There are many examples where -m is attached to a strong base—few of these contrast with simple (-m-less) transitive forms. The notable strong base with -m that contrasts with an -m-less transitive counterpart is k"ul'; already exemplified in 3.1. With strong bases, in other words, the normal case is that exemplified by n+iil-m(in), naq"-m-in:

61. a. nxfl-m
b. nq"-m

nxflmantson (*n+iil-n)¹⁹
naq"mantx" *naq"-min-nt-x"* (*naq"-nt)
I got scared of you.
You stole it.

The best evidence that this -m is the stressless allomorph of -m(f)n (here and in the examples that follow) comes from intransitivized negative forms:

62. a. lut k'u aksankfímmam.
b. lut k'u aksankfímmam isq"sí?*

don't be scared of me.
Don't scared of my son.

c. lut aksnd¡"-mmam.
d. lut k'u aksndq"-mmam inkwáp.

Don't steal it.
Don't steal my horse.

¹⁹See also examples 66m-r that share this base, and see footnote 21.
3.4. -nt transitive stems obligatorily with -min. Aside from the strong bases just discussed, there are other verb bases (weak and strong) that do not attach the transitive suffixes -nt and -tt without first adding -min. Here I give an example of a weak base:

63. a. kan ya·sqix.  
   I am shy, afraid of people.  
   They are skittish with/afraid of us.

b. k'u ya·míntam.  
   I am afraid of you and I didn’t ask you.  
   McG. Don’t be afraid of me / shy with me.

c. ya·míntson ut lut t'fíwntson.  
   I am afraid of you and I didn’t ask you.  
   MT

d. lut k'u aksya·míntam.  
   I am afraid of you and I didn’t ask you.  
   MT

Aside from the strong bases just discussed, there are other verb bases (weak and strong) that do not attach the transitive suffixes -nt and -tt without first adding -min. Here I give an example of a weak base:

63. a. kan ya·sqix.
   I am shy, afraid of people.
   They are skittish with/afraid of us.

b. k'u ya·míntam.
   I am afraid of you and I didn’t ask you.  
   MT

c. ya·míntson ut lut t'fíwntson.
   I am afraid of you and I didn’t ask you.  
   MT

d. lut k'u aksya·míntam.  
   I am afraid of you and I didn’t ask you.  
   MT

Here, too, can be classed cases such as x'tic'+x+m 'give away,' on which the -nt transitive stem x'tic'+x+m-nt is formed. -min and -nt must co-occur. I note again that there is a base x'tic' which forms stems x'tic'ít, x'tic'ít (but not *x'tic'ínt—see section 1.3.2.). x'tic'+x+m, then, is the base on which -nt (and -tt and -tuttt) stems are formed, as in the following examples:

64. a. x'tic'ímxxts.  
   You gave it away.

b. k'u x'tic'ímxxts ísqáw'.  
   He gave away my money.

c. k'u x'tic'ímxxtts ísqáw'.  
   He gave me her money.

Here I note that the -t stem has the regular reading of the direct object as possessor, and the -tuttt stem, as expected, has k'a as the indirect object. The approximate underlying representation of this base is x'tic'+x+minl, with -x and -m the weak allomorphs of -xix and -min, respectively.

3.5. -st causative stems with and without -min.

3.5.1. -st causative stems obligatorily with -min. Several causative stems obligatorily take -min. Here is a set of root-stressed examples:

65. a. p'úk'ómístan.  
   I completed it.

b. táf*ómístan.  
   I lowered it to him.

c. t'ít'ítmístx.  
   It's easy for you.

d. *tásítmístx.  
   You work with both.

I leave the discussion of -tix for a future paper. The suffix occupies a slot that precedes -min, which, in turn, precedes one of the transitivizers. This seems to differ from the workings of its Cr. cognate.

3.5.2. Causative stems without -min. There are bases that form causative stems attaching -st without -min; but these same bases require -min to form -nt and -tt stems:

66. a. nixi (*nixi-nt)  
   ha? k' nixap? McG  
   Have you heard the news?

b. nixi-m  
   ha? nixap? MT  
   Did you hear it?

c. ?ayx'í+t  
   k'ínt ?ayx't.  
   I am tired.

d. ?ayx'í+t-m  
   k'ínt ?ayx't.  
   I am tired.

e. ixt? ?ayx'tsta?  
   I got him tired.

f. ixt? ?ayx'tsta?  
   I got him tired.

g. ?ayx'tsta? inkáwá?  
   McG  
   I got my horse tired.

h. ?ayx'tsta? inkáwá?  
   McG  
   I got my horse tired.

i. im+t  
   k'ínt  
   I am glad.

j. im+t-m  
   k'ínt  
   I am glad.

k. ímístman.  
   McG  
   I made you glad.

l. ímístman.  
   McG  
   I’m glad to see you.

m. n+xíl~ n+xíl  
   kan n+xíl.  
   I am scared.

n. n+xíl~  
   kan n+xíl.  
   I am scared.

o. n+xíl~  
   I scared you.

p. n+xíl~  
   I scared you.

q. n+xíl~ í sk'a·çínam.  
   I scared the deer.

I will return to the discussion of -m-st stems in the next section and in section 3.9.

Sporadically speakers produce causatives with and without -m (alongside -nt transitives that require -m), as in the following examples:

21Note that for some speakers there is a stem n+xíl-st, and forms such as n+xílsta? 'I scared you,' and n+xílsta? í sk'a·çínam. ‘I scared the deer.’ are grammatical. Other speakers reject them.
I should point out that all transitives with -m(in)-nt have regular customary forms in -m-st, and these stems should not be construed as causative:

68. a. cnCxlCmstCm. I heard what you’re saying.
   b. cnCxlCmstCm. (customary)
   c. niCtCp kWu cyaCm·m'sfts. MT
      He’s always afraid of me.
   d. niCtCp kWu cyaCm·m'sfts. (k'it, strong)
      You always get near me.
   e. niCtCp kWu cyaCm·m'sfts. MT (k'it, strong)
      I was tired of it.
   f. niCtCp t'('apmCtCm. I shot your gun (gun is the target).
   g. niCtCp kU cyaCm·m'sfts. (k'it, strong)
      He shot a deer for me.
   h. niCtCp kWu cyaCm·m'sfts. MT
      Heshot my gun.

One will have noticed that all the examples of -m(in)-nt (not the customary forms just given) in this section are of strong stems. Were it not for their unexpected behavior with regard to stress, I could have included here examples such as the following:

I will mention two possible analyses of these forms in section 3.9.

3.6. Mutual exclusivity of -min and -xit. The best evidence that -min and -xit are mutually exclusive comes from bases that show, alongside intransitive stems, transitive stems with and without -min. t"ap 'shoot a target,' and t"ap+m'n 'shoot a weapon' are such bases:

70. kxn t"apmCm i? t sk'aCmÇfnam. MT
    I killed a (single) deer.

71. a. t"apCmCm. I shot (the target)
   b. t"apmCm. I shot (the weapon)
   c. kxn t"apCmCm i? t sk'aCmÇfnam. MT
      I got mad at my partner and I shot his horse.
   d. t"apmCmMT
      I shot your gun (gun is the target).
   e. k'U t"apCmCm i? t sk'aCmÇfnam. MT
      He shot a deer for me.
   f. *t"apCmCm. He shot a deer for me.
   g. niCtCp kWu t"apCmCm i? t sk'aCmÇfnam. MT
      He always shoots around with my gun.
   h. niCtCp kWu t"apCmCm i? t sk'aCmÇfnam. MT
      He always shoots my gun.

This last example shows a customary form with -fr (a regular construction). But I should add that the form is found to be less felicitous24 than one based on the stem t"ap+t'kwat-m(in):

72. niCtCp kWu t"ap+t'kwat-mCm i? t sk'aCmÇfnam. MT
    He always shoots around with my gun.

24At least by MT.
3.7. More on the workings of -\textit{min}. From the examples given thus far (and others), I cannot assign a gloss to -\textit{min} that does justice to its function. And there are examples of stems that come in pairs (with and without -\textit{min}) without apparent difference in meaning:

\textit{a.} k'\textquoteright a\textquoteright a\textquoteright a\textquoteright m\textquoteright fnt
look for it
\textit{b.} k'\textquoteright a\textquoteright a\textquoteright m\textquoteright fnt
  go look for it
\textit{c.} k'\textquoteright a\textquoteright m\textquoteright is
  he took it off
\textit{d.} k'\textquoteright a\textquoteright m\textquoteright is
  he took it off
\textit{e.} k'u\textquoteright wmn\textquoteright is
  he put out the light
\textit{f.} k'u\textquoteright wmn\textquoteright is
  he put out the light
\textit{g.} k'w\textquoteright u\textquoteright m\textquoteright is
  he took it off
\textit{h.} k'w\textquoteright u\textquoteright m\textquoteright is
  he took it off
\textit{i.} k'u\textquoteright wmn\textquoteright is
  he put out the light
\textit{j.} k'u\textquoteright wmn\textquoteright is
  he put out the light
\textit{k.} k'\textquoteright nt\textquoteright fn
  I went around it
\textit{l.} k'\textquoteright nt\textquoteright fn
  I went around it

I have not systematically tried to verify the semantics of all these stems, but in the course of the discussion of these matters, speakers have produced occasional examples that show a contrast between two stems, such as the following, based on \textit{t+xlk}:

\textit{a.} k'\textquoteright a\textquoteright k'\textquoteright a\textquoteright m\textquoteright fnt
  It's near.
\textit{b.} k'\textquoteright a\textquoteright k'\textquoteright a\textquoteright m\textquoteright fnt
  Get near to it!
\textit{c.} lut \textit{t+xlk} \textit{t+xlk} i\textquoteright k\textquoteright w\textquoteright \textit{utm\textquoteright x\textquoteright k\textquoteright m\textquoteright fn\textquoteright fn}
  I didn't want to see him, that's why I went around him. McG.

3.8. Other peculiarities of -\textit{min} bases. Not unlike other forms, -\textit{min} bases show peculiarities and idiosyncrasies. Here I give several examples.

3.8.1. -\textit{min} transitivized with either -\textit{nt} or -\textit{st}. -\textit{min} added to \textit{sw'st} gives a base that can be transitivized with either -\textit{nt} or -\textit{st}, and this matches the fact that there are two imperatives of \textit{sw'st}, each typical of the -\textit{nt} and -\textit{st} stems, respectively:

\textit{a.} sw's\textit{st} (intr)
  \textit{k'an}_k\textit{ksfw'st}a\textquoteright x.
  I'm going to drink.
\textit{b.} sw's\textit{st} (trans)
  \textit{sw'st}a\textquoteright x?
  Drink this!
\textit{c.} sw's\textit{st} (trans)
  \textit{sw'st}a\textquoteright x?
  Drink this!
\textit{d.} k\textit{u} sw's\textit{st}tx\textit{x}.
  You drank mine.
\textit{e.} k\textit{u} sw's\textit{st}tx\textit{x}.
  You gave me a drink.
\textit{f.} k\textit{u} sw's\textit{st}tx\textit{x}.
  You gave me a drink.
\textit{g.} lut k\textit{u} aksfw's\textit{stmn}am. McG
  Don't give me a drink.
\textit{h.} lut k\textit{u} aksfw's\textit{stmn}am. McG
  Don't give me a drink (of that).
\textit{i.} k\textit{u} aksfw's\textit{stmn}am? McG
  Are you going to give me a drink?
\textit{j.} k\textit{u} aksfw's\textit{stmn}am? McG
  Are you going to give me a drink?
to promote an analysis of words into stems and inflectional affixes, in preference to a linear morphological segmentation of words.

Both the bases mdįška? 'lie to someone,' and k+mdįška? 'lie about something/somebody,' where the derivational prefix k- carries the difference in meaning reflected in the glosses, take -min only in certain paradigms.

Besides the intransitive

80. kǝn_mdįška?
I lied

there are transitive forms

81.

a. kǝn_mdįška?ns.
He lied to me.

b. kǝn_k+mdįška?ns.
He lied about me.

c. nįr*ip kǝn_cmąška?nst. RA
He always lies to me.

d. nįr*ip kǝn_cmąška?nst.
He always lies to me.

e. mǝl Jáša?nun. RA
I accidentally lied to him.

I have found no forms *kǝn_ (k+j/mdįška?)-m-s (or other -m(in) + transitivizer) yet there are negative forms

82.

a. lut kǝn_aksmdįška?am. McG
Don't lie to me.

b. lut kǝn_aksmdįška?am.
Don't lie about me. RA

c. lut aksmąška?mnam. MT37
Don't lie to me.

d. lut kǝn_aksmdįška?mnam. MT
Don't lie about me.

e. lut aksmdįška?m asl*ált. MT, RA
Don't lie to him.

f. lut aksmąška?mnam asl*ált. McG
Don't lie about your partner.

36 By which I mean an analysis that breaks up the form morpheme by morpheme, without consideration for the stem as a significant unit of word formation.

37 This and the next three examples parallel the examples discussed in footnote 14.

38 Why there should be a long l in this form, I don't know.

Not unexpectedly forms with and without m compete in the -fr paradigm:

83. lut kǝn_aksmdįška?am tsq'sl??. RA
Don't lie about my son.

The stem t+q*alq*filt+mn-nt 'talk about someone/something,' like k+mdįška?, shows in its bases a k- prefix that added to verb bases derives stems the meanings of which (in spite of these two examples) are not recoverable from those of the base. Like mdįška?-nt, there is a k-less stem q*alq*ft-st 'talk to someone.' But whereas (k+j/mdįška?) shows the peculiarities I have outlined, q*alq*ft-st and t+q*alq*filt+mn-nt, aside from the different allomorphs, are regular in all respects:

84. kǝn_q*alq*ft lsqflx*can.
I talk the Indian language.

85.

a. q*alq*ftstman. MT
I talked to you.

b. tq*alq*ftltmanx*. MT
I talked to you.

c. ta?lli? āst ca?k* t q*alq*ftltmanx*.
It's good that you should talk about it.

The bases x*ist-ntn and t*x*ist-ntn (again involving the prefix k-) are sometimes translated differently, but in practice are often used interchangeably:

86. kǝn_x*ist.
I walk, travel

87.

a. x*istmanx*.
You walk the land.

b. tǝx*istmanx*.
You pace the area off.

c. tǝx*istman astl*ált, mi tǝqntx*.
Walk to your partner and touch him.

d. lut kǝn_aksntm*stam Mount isq'st?.30 RA
Don't walk up to my son.

39 I consider t- an allomorph of k- that occurs before bases that begin with (post)velars.

37 I also have a form lut kǝn_aksntm*stam Mount isq'st?, also given by RA, but I discount it as the product of too much coffee, too late in the afternoon, after too much paradigmatic eliciting.
The suffix -mist\(^2\) is part of bases that can further derive -m\(n\) stems. Consider the base tiw 'buy something' and the base tw+mist 'sell something.' Here, and in similar cases, the internal structure of the base is irrelevant—it plus -m\(n\) form the stem that -m\(n\) heads. tiw is the base for a simple -nt transitive stem as:

88. tiw
   tiw-nt-\(\theta\)-x
   buy-nt-it-you
   You bought it.

tiw plus -mist forms the base tw+mist, which, by itself, is an intransitive stem, as in

89. tumfstå x ak'tsq“\(\theta\)”y.
   tu+mfstå -x t a- k\(\alpha\) t+q“\(\theta\)”y.
   buy intr_jmp tv t your fut gum
   Buy some gum!

tw+mist (a strong base that retains the stressed vowel) plus -min form the base for a transitive stem like tw+mist-m\(n\)-nt:

90. tumfståntså
   tw+mfstå -m\(n\) -nt -\(\theta\) -x
   sell -m\(n\) -nt -\(\theta\) -x
   sell -m\(n\) -nt -it -you
   You sold it.

Here is the same stem c-tw+mist+mn-st in the customary aspect (ac-...-st):

91. acutumfståntså
   ac- tw+mfstå -m\(n\) -st -\(\theta\) -s -lx
   cust sell -m\(n\) -st -it -3rd -pl
   They sell it.

Consider also the following constructions based on the root \(\sqrt{k’a’}\)

92. kan k’a’m
   kan k’a’ -m
   I pray middle
   I pray.

93. k’a’amfståntså.
   k’a+mfstå -m\(n\) -nt -s -n
   hire -min -nt you I
   I hired you.
   Don't hire him.

94. lut k’u aksk’a’mfståntså isq’så? RA
   lut k’u a- ks- k’a+mfstå -mn -n
   not me your fut hire -mn -nt intr
   Don't hire my son.

The root siw 'ask' is found in many stems, from the simplest intransitive ones, to some with considerable morphological material.

95. a. intransitive stem siw-\(m\) ‘ask’
   lut akšfwm.
   Don't ask.

   c. lut k’u akšacsfwm. RA
   Don’t be asking me.

   e. intransitive stem sw-tilfån ‘ask info.’
   kan surtifån
   I inquired.

   g. kan surtifån?x.
   I'm going to ask around. RA

3\(^{1}\)The question of whether or not -mist historically is -m\(n\)-st (where -st is a vowelless allomorph of -c\(\alpha\)/-c\(\alpha\) 'reflexive'), does not bear on the synchronic analysis. Nor should these forms be analyzed synchronically, as consisting of a root plus sequences of affixes, without restriction for repeated occurrences of the same affix in a single word. In Okanagan, for example, there is a suffix -st that can be connected with -c\(\alpha\) 'reflexive.' See, for example, kan k’a’al’st ‘I practiced;’ kan k’a’al’ancání ‘I cooked;’ k’a’l’ancidan ‘creator,’ all including the root \(\sqrt{k’a’}\). A linear analysis of the forms would not account, among other things, for the stress properties of the reflexive -st / -c\(\alpha\). Forms such as these abound, and they call for an analysis that proceeds from base to stem to word (in preference to a linear segmentation of morphemes).
h. intransitive stem k-stw-pla? ‘ask about’
    kan kswplam t ikctix*.  
    I inquired if there would be a house for me.

i. transitive stem k-stw-pla?‘nt ‘ask for something/someone’
    k'u kswplas.
    He asked for me.

j. intransitive stem ksupla?mst ‘ask for one’s own benefit’
    k:ln ksupla?mst t ikctix*.
    I asked if there would be a house for me.

k. transitive stem sw+pla?+mst+man-nj
    xuyx mi ksupla?mstmanx*.
    Go ask him.

l. k'u k-su-pla?-mst-mn-(n)l-am
    They asked us a special permission.

m. l'ut k'u aksksupla?mstmanam.
    Don’t ask me for directions.

n. intransitive stem n+sw+cn+mst ‘propose’
    k:ln n+su+cn+mst.
    I proposed.

o. way’ t'ax* lut iksnsukanmst, ar'f? way’ ti k'u luttsalx.
    I am not going to propose, because they will turn me down,

p. transitive stem n+sw+cn+mst+mn+nt ‘propose to someone’
    k'u n-su-cn-mst-man-(n)t-x*.
    You proposed to me.

In sum, the use of the symbol + aims to avoid the irrelevance of the internal make up of the base, 
which would be even more cluttered were -mst and the transitivizers to be segmented further.

3.9. -mst or -m. Recall the problem presented by sets of forms like 69a-c and the following:

96.
   a. lk'-nt ‘tie something’
     k'u laksantis.
     He tied me.
   b. lk' + m-st
     k'u laksantis.
     He forced me.

The problem is that lk’ (and the bases of 69a-c) are weak. -mst attached to a weak base should result 
in a form base + mst (where the stress in on -mst). These stems with ...m-st-... are weak, however.
One could either analyze them as containing an -m (of indeterminate -mst-like function), or explore the 
possibility that the sequence weak base + mst derives a (weak) base that, in the causative paradigm only, 
loses its stress to the subject referents. This is a proposal that, provided one finds historical evidence 
to suggest that an earlier suffix *-stV is a strong suffix, and that Ok -st has retained the slot for the 
stressed vowel, is not as unlikely as might at first seem. This, too, will have to be discussed some other 
time.
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